# THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIV APRIL, 1961 No. 490

## The Catechism Revised

THE proposed revised catechism[1] makes encouraging reading for all those who view with puzzlement the apparent contentment of many of the clergy with the Prayer Books of 1661 and 1928. But things are moving at last, and through trial and error the Prayer Book is being revised piecemeal, which seems to be quite the most hopeful method. It is probably accurate to speak already of the failure of the Liturgical Commission's attempt at revision of the services of Baptism and Confirmation which suggested dreams in the study rather than human occasions in the parish church; and indeed the Bishop of Southwark, a member of the Commission, has already gone far to admitting this in urging clergy and laity (the "customers") in his own diocese to put up a revision of the Baptism service themselves. This is a great step forward in that it should make it very difficult to mount further liturgical efforts without lay participation and a far stronger representation of the ordinary parish clergy.

The Revised Catechism, however, should certainly not fail. It is a bold and sensible attempt on which a few comments may be allowable from the level of the country parish.

I would give unqualified approval of the disappearance of the mysterious "N or M" who has always been a great time-waster in the village school, as of the removal of "the devil", "the pomps" and "the lusts".

The devil has always had and apparently still has his devoted supporters amongst the clergy, but if we play him too hard we are opening the door to a practical dualism. I should have thought it far wiser to demote him, and leave church people free to make up their own minds about the reality or relevance of this picturesque character. (After all, Satan is the undoubted though undesigned hero of *Paradise Lost*!) It is often said that the more explanation and qualification a statement needs the more suspect it should be, which certainly applies to this catalogue of evils in 1661 and 1928. The Baptism Reform Movement and many others will be glad to see that parents are now given a place with godparents in naming their child, but it is only logical that they should be likewise coupled with the godparents in the question: "What did your godparents do for you at your Baptism?" The word "malice", which for some reason is difficult for children to understand, is well-replaced by "grudge" in the Duty to my Neighbour; and in the requirements for Baptism "repentance, whereby they forsake sin" is altered to "turn from sin". This is adequate, but I should like to see something a little more

[1] *A Revised Catechism*. S.P.C.K. 1960. 2s.

vivid, such as "turn their backs on sin". There are one or two other small criticisms: a suggestion of tautology in "renounce all that is wrong and fight against evil"; jumping from "Holy Spirit" to "Holy Ghost" in one or two places (could we not forget the "Holy Ghost" and go firm on "Holy Spirit"?); the use of both "Matrimony" and "marriage", "Matrimony" with a capital and "marriage" without. No doubt both are included to familiarize the children with the two words, but could we not again go firm on one or the other, preferably the one in common use: "marriage"? The "fear" of God has been omitted, which is just as well, but I think it a pity that we have now no teaching on "this state of salvation" which has always been a most useful text for a discussion of the meaning of salvation as opposed to some of the "gospel sects".

To turn to somewhat larger issues, it is a pity that the phraseology in Questions 3 and 4 is identical except for the next to penultimate word: Q.3. "What did God do for you in your Baptism?" Q.4. "What did your godparents do for you at your Baptism?" There may be some subtle theological distinction between "in" and "at" your Baptism which the fully initiated will appreciate, but I think it more important that some distinction should be drawn in phraseology between the acts of God and man at baptism. In Q.3 some such phrase as: "What did God work in you at your Baptism?" might be more of a contrast with Q.4, thus avoiding the "did . . . do" in both cases.

Again modern theologians might be happier if throughout this Catechism greater emphasis was laid on the whole of the incarnate life of our Lord, and not just on his death and resurrection. They might also be concerned about the last section on "The Christian Hope", where the Bishop of Woolwich would probably want to reword to a certain extent, though this would be, I should think, a very difficult task.

Q.24(7) is an interesting example of not only restating "to keep my body in temperance, soberness, and chastity" by "to be clean in thought, word and deed" but also attempting to add to it unnecessarily. One of the greatest needs of the Church is a positive attitude towards sexuality, but to add anxiously to the simple statement on cleanness in thought, word, and deed, the phrase "controlling my bodily desires through the power of the Holy Spirit who dwells within me" appears to be a nervous return to prim flutterings over "all the sinful lusts of the flesh" which had previously been so firmly suppressed in the first glad flush of revision. This timid little sermonette had better go, leaving Q.24(7) like this: "To be clean in thought, word, and deed; and if called to the state of marriage, to live faithfully in it."

Q.34 attempts to define a sacrament. The magnificent rotundity of the classical definition is hard to improve upon—but is very difficult to teach clearly. The revision is a praiseworthy attempt to say the same thing more simply. Might it not be wiser not to attempt to say again what has already been said incomparably? Make the question plural: "What do you mean by sacraments?" and reply something like this: 'By sacraments I mean that God comes to me through

earthly things such as water, bread, wine and human hands." The further teaching would go on to explain, as it in fact does, the meaning of this perhaps astonishing and I hope arresting statement.

"The inward and spiritual grace" of Q.35 becomes, in Q.47, "the inward and spiritual gift". Why is this? Anyway the child is already concerned enough with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit and will be confused by a fourth "thing" described as "grace" in Questions 25 and 26. If we kept the word "gift" in Q.47 and put it for "grace" in Q.35 we could then in Questions 25 and 26 (*et seriatim*) modify to refer to the need for God's "help" through the Holy Spirit and the subject of grace would not be introduced at all. We should beware of cramming all the great Christian words into the Catechism, which makes me also doubtful of "advocate" in the answer to Q.9.

Finally, could we not use this opportunity to revise the Lord's Prayer in two very small ways: ". . . *who* art in heaven" and "*those who* trespass against us". And it would not be talking down to the children, for whom this instruction is intended, if in the answer to Q.42, "Why then are infants baptized?" we said "Infants are baptized because, although they are not yet *old enough* (for 'of age') to make the promises for themselves . . ." They talk about being or not being "old enough" every day, but I've never heard a child prattle about being or not being "of age". Although the revisers have covered themselves by explaining that they have not written for any particular age group it is surely desirable that, in the production of a Catechism, children should be primarily in mind.

I am not at all sure that this statement should not be strengthened to say that children alone should be in mind when producing a Catechism, which is after all only a syllabus of Christian instruction. As soon as you think in terms of adults a syllabus merges into an exposition of the faith, and to expound the Christian faith within the bounds of brief questions and answers is virtually impossible. After all there is ample opportunity to-day for adults to read much fuller expositions of the Christian religion in cheap paper backs than could ever be found in potted questions and answers.

Subject to the few modifications suggested above, I think our revisers have done a great work which will be understood by children, and they should firmly reject any demands to go any further and explain what they mean! As they themselves have pointed out, manuals may well be produced suitable for different age groups to *expound* what is here *stated*. But the Executive Committee of the Diocese of Nova Scotia have taken another line and published a "Catechism for Adults", which makes somewhat uncomfortable reading because it is, I believe, attempting the impossible. Few of us would be happy with the departmentalizing of the unity of man's nature suggested by Q.1: "By whom was man created?" A. "God in his great love created man and gave him a physical and a spiritual nature"; which is followed up by Q.4: "What is the great need of man's spiritual nature?" And the answer: "Man needs Religion in order to fulfil the demands of his spiritual nature . . ." If our religion is only the cosy concern of our "spiritual nature", what has

happened to it as the transformer of the whole man and the driving force of society? No, if you are setting out to explain the faith fully to the adult you must write him a book and introduce him to the living society of Christians. If you try to satisfy him with a neat and tidy Catechism you are driven to such things as the rather amusing petulance of the answer to Q.24 in this Canadian attempt: "Was a new Church started by Henry VIII?" A. "Certainly not. It was the same Church . . ." And when you introduce the adult to the Christian society he will grow out of A.B.C.'s of salvation after the style of the old tracts.

MARTIN COOPER.

---

## William Law: Non-juror, Writer, and Mystic

CONSISTENCY in matters of principle leads to martyrdom in one form or another; for in the world of public affairs, both ecclesiastical and secular, those who would lead must practice "the art of the possible". By his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance to the Hanoverians and abjuration of the Stuarts in 1714 William Law condemned himself to a life of isolation from public affairs, in which his outstanding intellectual gifts would have enabled him to play a leading part. His life of seclusion, though never one of inactivity, led to such a development of thought and personality as in itself to a great extent caused his name to lapse into undeserved obscurity. In its first issue of the year *The Times* did not include his name in the centenaries of 1961—he died on 9 April 1761—and even in the religious world few know more about him than that he wrote the *Serious Call*. Law knew well the consequences of his decision: to his brother he wrote at the time, "My prospect is melancholy enough . . . The benefits of my education seem partly at an end, but that same education had been more miserably lost if I had not learnt to fear something more than misfortunes." Logical, clear-headed and courageous, Law never flinched from the consequences of his convictions.

Despite the general obscurity, even among educated people, which has surrounded him, there have in every generation been discerning minds who have appreciated his qualities of character and thought. Edward Gibbon, to whose father Law was tutor for a number of years, said of him: "In our family he had left the reputation of a worthy and pious man, who believed all that he professed, and practised all that he enjoined." F. D. Maurice, Leslie Stephen, von Hügel, Dean Inge, and in the present day, Aldous Huxley, all pay tribute to him. Evelyn Underhill said of him, "William Law, so far as I know, is the only spiritual thinker of the first rank among the English mystics of the post-Reformation church". Interest in Law is not confined to this country. In 1939 in Germany Dr K. Minkner published a study of Law's mystical theology; while the best short introduction

to Law's thought and writings is by Henri Talon, professor of English literature at Dijon, published in 1948: *William Law: a study in literary craftsmanship.*

William Law was born in 1686 at King's Cliffe in Northamptonshire, seven miles from Stamford, where his father was a grocer. The family, having lived there for several generations, had some social standing; there are memorials of the Law family in the parish church. He entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, as a sizar, in 1705, took his B.A. in 1708, was elected fellow and took orders in 1711. At his entry into the university he drew up a set of rules for his conduct, exhibiting then that moral earnestness, which, with the passage of years, became increasingly the predominant note in his character. The rules are given in full in Overton's *Life*,[1] (pp. 6–7); but the first is worth quoting as an example of the general tenour of them all, "to fix it deep in my mind that I have but one business on my hands —to seek for eternal happiness by doing the will of God". Law's academic prospects were bright, but were completely ruined by his refusal to abjure the Stuart dynasty. He thus became one of the second generation of Nonjurors, resigned his fellowship, and withdrew for ever from the public ministry of the church; though he never faltered in his loyalty to the Church of England, regularly attending all services in the church at King's Cliffe in the last period of his life.

From about 1723–38 he lived at Lime Grove at Putney, the home of Edward Gibbon, grandfather of the historian. He was tutor to his son, whom he accompanied when he was in residence as an undergraduate at Emmanuel, and appears to have been a private chaplain to the family. The years at Putney were a time of literary activity (the *Serious Call* was written there), and during this time Law made many acquaintances, the most important being John Wesley. Here too Law was visited by John Byrom, author of much indifferent and some good verse, best known as the writer of "Christians Awake". There grew up a great affection between the two: Byrom, an attractive and lovable person, was to Law a lesser Boswell, and from his Journal much may be learnt of Law's character and opinions.[2]

In 1736 Mr Gibbon, the elder, died, and not long after the household broke up. A year or two later Law went to live at King's Cliffe, staying there till his death. In 1743 he was joined by Miss Hesther Gibbon, sister of his former pupil, and Mrs Eliza Hutcheson, a well-to-do widow. They all lived together at Hall Yard, now known as Hall Farm, an ancient house just across the road from the east end of the church. The three set themselves to lead a life of ordered devotion and good works. Between them they disposed of an income of £3,000 a year; of this they kept £300 for their domestic needs and gave the rest away, largely in indiscriminate charity. King's Cliffe became a Mecca for beggars, but despite the protests of the rector and parishioners, Law and his companions persisted in the practice. They

[1] J. H. Overton. *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic.* 1881.
[2] H. Talon. *John Byrom* (*Selections from his Journals*). 1950.

founded schools for boys and girls, with strict rules about their religious training, and almshouses for elderly women. Their life at Hall Yard (where the window from which Law dispensed his ill-judged alms may be seen) was not ascetic: they lived simply, but with comfort, and had some social intercourse with the neighbouring gentry. It was an ordered life. Law rose at five, and after a frugal breakfast spent the first hours of the day in prayer and study. At nine he joined the others for family devotions. After more study and attention to the claims of the poor he dined with the others at noon. There followed more devotions; then he retired for more reading and writing in his study. Later they had tea, then a short prayer, and afterwards a break, in which he would walk or they would go out together, Law on his horse, the ladies in their carriage. Last there came a light supper, the closing devotions of the day, and to bed at nine o'clock.

This was their routine for many years, varied by visits from friends like Byrom, and others who wished to consult Law. It was for him a life of utter renunciation of the world and its glory, but he was happy: Byrom called him a "happy poor man". They had their interests and their recreations, of which one was music (Law's music room, a fine high-ceilinged room decorated in the style of the period, may also be seen). Law had the idea that everybody could sing; and recommended in the *Serious Call* that even in their private devotions Christians should sing hymns and psalms. He persuaded the rector of King's Cliffe to have the psalms sung in the parish church. Here, at the age of seventy-five, after a short illness, he died, singing a hymn at the very last. In his last words he said that the opening of the Spirit of Love in the soul was all in all. His tomb, where Mrs Hutcheson also is buried, stands just inside the north-east corner of the churchyard overlooking the house where he had lived for twenty years.

The external life of William Law was comparatively uneventful: the real interest of the man is in his writings; there he reveals his greatness. His work falls under three heads: as controversialist, moralist, and mystic.

The "age of reason" delighted in argument, and controversy was conducted in books, large and small, and tracts. As a controversialist Law excelled, clear-headed, logical, quick to pick out the weak points of his opponent's arguments, knowing how to use his rich sense of humour as a telling weapon, yet with never any rancour. Ruthless in the cut-and-thrust of debate, his driving force was the compelling love of truth, so that in none of his writings did he go beyond the limits set by charity and humility. A man of genius, he was able to argue effectively and successfully with the leading figures of the day.

His most famous opponent was Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, a leading Latitudinarian, and prime supporter of the Hanoverian dynasty. Law's *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*,[1] written

[1] J. O. Nash and C. H. Gore. *William Law's Defence of Church Principles*. 1893.

between 1717 and 1719, when he was still a young man, are the best known of his polemical works. Almost too easily Law was able to show that the influential churchman's thesis that sincerity alone was the basis of the Church was destructive of the Church as a recognizable order in the world. Law's power of satire is perfectly shown in the imaginary address to candidates whom he is about to confirm, which he puts into the mouth of Hoadly, as a *reductio ad absurdum* of his view of the powers of the Christian ministry. In this address he makes Hoadly say that, although he is a bishop, he has no spiritual powers that other men have not, and therefore they must look for no special blessing at his hands.

These letters reveal Law to be a Tory High Churchman in his views on the nature of the Church, ministry, and sacraments. Later writings showed that, though never faltering in his loyalty to the Church of England, he grew (especially as mysticism became the dominating occupation of his mind) more "liberal" in his views on Christian denominations, and had little sympathy with the spirit of factious loyalty and bigotry. Even towards the Roman Church, while conscious of its errors, he was appreciative of its holy lives and teaching, recognizing that all denominations had their shortcomings. He saw sectarian loyalties to be the fruit of the divided state of Christendom, and the sectarian spirit a thing to be deplored. A truly Catholic spirit lives in universal love to all Christians, rejoices in the truth to be found among them, and eschews all partisanship in religious matters. Law's views, which are surprisingly apposite to the modern religious situation, are set out in *Some Animadversions on Dr Trapp's late reply*. (*Works*. vi. pp. 182–184). Of this work in which he defends "Enthusiasm", Caroline Spurgeon says it is "one of the best things he wrote".[1]

In dealing with the Deist Tindal, Law had an easy task, because, although the problems lying behind Deism posed by the developing scientific knowledge of the day were real, yet the Deists as a whole were intellectually poor stuff. Their main contribution lay in the answers they called forth such as Law's *Case of Reason or Natural Religion* (1731) and Bishop Butler's *Analogy*. The main argument of Tindal's *Christianity as old as Creation* was that revelation was unnecessary: for the truth about God could be known, and had always since creation been known, by the light of human reason. Man's conduct must be determined by what his reason tells him of the fitness of things, not by any pretended revelation of the will of God. Law agreed that Christianity was as old as creation, but countered that if God be supremely perfect then the reason and fitness of things must necessarily show that such a God must act by a rule infinitely above human comprehension, and therefore logically Tindal's argument falls to the ground. Strangely enough such was the hold of "Reason" on men's minds that Law's answer to Tindal was little appreciated by his contemporaries, and is more valued now than then.

[1] *Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, ix. 326.

Tindal was the "deistical optimist": a few years earlier (1724) Law had answered the "cynical pessimist" Mandeville. It was this answer to Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* which called forth the admiration of F. D. Maurice, who published an edition of it, with a long preface by himself. Mandeville's book was a Hudibrastic fantasy: the argument at issue underlying the curious form of the book was the origin of morality as a divine or a human thing. Of Law's argument Maurice's friend, John Sterling, said, "I have never seen, in our language, the elementary grounds of a rational ideal philosophy, as opposed to empiricism, stated with nearly the same clearness, simplicity and force".

These and his many other controversial works (with the exception of *The Absolute Unlawfulness of Stage Entertainments*, his weakest work, written as a young man) indicate the character and quality of his writing as a controversialist. They reveal his first-rate intellectual abilities and his views on theological issues which in every age are of concern to Christians. Also, in common with his other works, they are of great literary merit. Caroline Spurgeon says of the end of the *First Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*: "it is one of the finest pleas in our language for the right use of passion, and admirably sums up the fundamental difference in outlook between the mystic and the rationalist temper in the things of the spirit".

Interesting as are his controversial writings it is as a writer and teacher in "spiritual matters" that Law made his most effective impression on Christian history. He was both moralist and mystic: his teaching on Christian perfection was a decisive formative factor in the growth of early Methodism; the development of his more specifically mystical teaching, however, is probably the chief reason for the obscurity into which he fell so soon after his death.

*A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1728) still has a steady sale. Many from Dr Johnson onwards have testified to its power. Johnson said that his reading of the book was the first occasion of his "thinking in earnest of religion after he became capable of rational enquiry". Leslie Stephen said its "power can only be adequately felt by readers who can study it on their knees". The book is not a "devotional book" in the ordinary sense of the word: but rather a systematic inquiry into what constitutes Christian devotion, and a call to forsake the worldly life. The opening paragraph states that devotion does not consist in "acts of devotion" but in a "life given or devoted to God". A feature of the book, characteristic of the literature of the age, and effectively used by Law in several of his works, are the character sketches of types of individuals. Many are deftly drawn, and give point to his general teaching: the two sisters, Flavia, the nominal but worldly minded Christian, Miranda, the truly devout; Cognatus, the clerical pluralist and farmer, Negotius, the diligent man of business, who would be very religious, if only he had the time; Matilda, the mother as she is, Eusebia, the mother as she ought to be; and finally Ouranius, the good country parson, drawn in the pattern of Chaucer and George Herbert, in whose characterization no doubt the lineaments of Law's own personality

can be discerned. The book is one of the spiritual classics of all time.

It was, however, an earlier, and now less well-known book *On Christian Perfection* (1726), which brought John Wesley into contact with Law. Its strong teaching on renunciation of the world made a deep impression on him, leading him to visit Law at Putney, and to look to Law for some years as his spiritual guide. The break came later, after Wesley's contact with the Moravian brethren and his "conversion". Despite his deep regard for Law, Wesley felt conscientiously bound to criticize him publicly for what he believed to be deficiencies in his teaching, mainly that he had not taught the saving and liberating effects of faith in Christ.[1] Law's defence was that such teaching was implicit in all that he wrote and taught. There is however a measure of truth in the criticism as the *Serious Call* (and other writings) sets out the austere challenge of the Christian religion, but has little of the brightness of the Gospel: consequently there is a danger that his teaching will have a discouraging effect on many, making them feel unequal to living up to its standards, and not revealing how, by the grace of God, this can be done.

Newton Flew[2] says that two great influences operated on the mind of Wesley as he formed his characteristic teaching on Christian perfection: first the influence of earlier writers and saints of the Church, and secondly the experience of individual Christians. Among the first Law was the most influential. The first biographers of John Wesley said: "by his excellent pen Mr Law was the great forerunner of the revival which followed and did more to promote it than the rest of the nation collectively taken". John Wesley himself said in a sermon "there was some truth in Dr Trapp's assertion that Mr Law was their parent". The *Serious Call* was one of the books prescribed to be read by Methodist "preachers on trial". Law's influence on Methodism lay in the ethical emphasis which characterized the movement, an emphasis deriving its impetus from the profound effect on its founder of Law's treatises on practical Christianity. Harold Nicholson, in his recently published *Age of Reason*, deplores the fact that the breach with Wesley deprived Methodism of the services of Law's "exalted intelligence and literary capacity".

From the time of his settlement at King's Cliffe the principal interest of Law's life lay in mysticism. He had always been interested in the subject, but his introduction to the works of the German shoemaker mystic Jacob Boehme (or Behmen, as he was usually called at the time) came to Law as a flash of inspiration. He gave himself wholeheartedly to mystical theology. Law had been acquainted with the teaching of Father Malebranche, the French Roman Catholic mystical writer, in his younger days. He also knew and criticized the teaching of Madame Guyon. He had many of the well-known spiritual classics in his library: *Theologica Germanica*, Tauler, Ruysbroeck, a Kempis, St John of the Cross, St Francis de Sales, Brother Lawrence, Fénelon, were all familiar to him. John Byrom, in his first visit to Law at Putney, had an enjoyable conversa-

[1] Cp. Overton, pp. 82–7.
[2] *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*, p. 314.

tion with him on mystical matters.[1] But Behmen was the teacher to whom Law devoted himself with all his being, and from whom he gained the impetus to develop his own mystical teaching.[2]

Most of Law's major works in the last period of his life were concerned with mysticism: the *Spirit of Prayer* was written in 1749, *Christian Regeneration* in 1750, *The Way to Divine Knowledge* and the *Spirit of Love* in 1752. Much of it is strange reading, moving at times almost in the realm of theosophy: but there are many beautiful passages and much sound teaching, as for example on the new birth which is at the heart of the Christian religion. The spirit of love breathes through all these writings. As would be expected one of Law's great texts was Luke 17. 21, "the kingdom of God is within you". Man is by birth the offspring of God: he has an eternity within him; and has never lost the image of God, but is in this world to achieve eternal life with God or eternal hell without him. God is present in our hearts and minds as "the light that lighteneth every man", and man's endeavour is to return to that glorious state in which he was first created. The whole world and the universe is a spiritual creation (Malebranche had taught *omnia videmus in Deo*); and Law has much to say about the spiritual meaning and properties of light, darkness, and fire.

There is much in Law's mystical teaching which has affinities with the ideas of the Quakers: but curiously enough Law was unswerving in his condemnation of the sect: yet the best study of his mystical writings is by a member of the Society of Friends, Stephen Hobhouse.[3] The *Spirit of Love* is the most finished of Law's mystical writings. In this last mystical period of his life Law drew away from the spirit of the eighteenth century. He despised and condemned human learning and the power of reason as utterly of no avail towards the knowledge of God, which must be sought in the heart, although he could say that "God is reason itself". Yet in this period he became more and more liberal in his attitude towards all who were truly seekers after God, both in other Christian denominations and even in other religions. His mystical writings reveal a side of his character which is not evident in his controversial writings, and are well worthy of study.

Law destroyed his worldly prospects in early life by the logical consistency of his convictions (no man was ever more self-consistent), yet he never repined over his lot, nor allowed his intellectual powers to stagnate. Caroline Spurgeon calls him "our greatest prose mystic", and says of him, "Law is among the greatest of English prose writers, and no one ever more truly possessed than he the splendid and imperishable excellence of sincerity and strength". Why was Law, as Byrom said, "so mightily out of fashion", and has remained so ever since? Possibly it may be, as Leslie Stephen said: "he was too little in harmony with his age to be understood during his lifetime, and

[1] Talon. *John Byrom*, 155 ff., 175 ff., 220 ff.

[2] For Behmen's teaching: cp. Spurgeon, *Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, ix. 314–8; *Enc. Relig. and Ethics*, Art., "Böhme".

[3] S. Hobhouse. *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*. 1948.

was yet too much affected by contemporary influences to do full justice to his powers".[1] Religion with Law became subjective and emotional, when to all his contemporaries it was historical and rational. The heart displaces reason. "God is love, yea, all love: and is so love that nothing but love can come from him: and the Christian religion is nothing but an open manifestation of his universal love to all mankind." (Law had no place for wrath in the thought of God, and came very near universalism.) With such sentiments on the love of God all would agree, but they were part of a mystical system which repelled the more active Christians of his day (especially the Methodists); and it may be that his mysticism has limited Law's influence, except among the inquiring few such as Coleridge. His moral and intellectual greatness cannot be challenged, and in his writings is much with which the modern reader must be in sympathy, especially his horror of war and his high estimate of the intellectual capacity of women. Law had an essentially masculine mind and his spiritual writings lack the feminine tenderness of St Francis de Sales and Fénelon: yet within an outward severity of manner there was a deep humility. He had his faults—a certain impatience with minds weaker than his own, leading sometimes to irascibility. The great gap in his life, due to his inevitable withdrawal from the world, was that he had no personal contact with men of his own intellectual power, which led to a peremptoriness in his manner. Yet he could show great tenderness to those who asked his counsel: he loved children (who were not afraid of him), and contemporaries spoke of the cheerfulness of his countenance. Towards the end of his life he said to Francis Okely, "Sir, I am not fond of religious gossiping: my best thoughts are in my works and to them I recommend you. If I should seem to you a positive old fellow I cannot help it, well knowing the ground from which I write. But, dear Sir, above all things be present with and attend carefully to your own heart. There you will be sure to meet with all evil, and there only can you meet with God and all goodness."

*Note.*—The most accessible edition of Law's works is *Works of the Rev. W. Law, M.A.*, 9 vv., privately printed by G. Moreton, London, 1892. In addition to books already mentioned, the following are useful for further study: J. H. Overton, *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic*, 1881, is the fullest biography, but needs supplementing by later studies; also C. Spurgeon, *Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, ix. c. 12. C. Walton, *Notes and Materials for an Adequate Biography of William Law*, 1854: a book without index or order, but an enormous footnote from pp. 334–628 contains much information about Law. Law's relationship to Methodism is studied in J. Brazier Green, *John Wesley and William Law*, 1945, and E. W. Baker, *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival*, 1948. For Law's mysticism and relationship to the Quakers: S. Hobhouse, *William Law and Eighteenth-Century Quakerism*, 1927, and the work on Law's mysticism referred to in the article. See also Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, for many extracts from Law. A general study will be found in A. W. Hopkinson, *William Law, a running commentary*, 1948.

MAURICE BANTING

[1] L. Stephen. *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, i. 158.

# Revised Reviews: IV—Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey: The Riddle of the New Testament

Ever since the barren quest for an "undogmatic" Jesus of history was helped to its *reductio ad absurdum* by Albert Schweitzer, the main pendulum of New Testament scholarship has been swinging until recently towards abandoning the quest altogether in favour of concentrating exclusively on the Christ of the apostolic *kerygma*. Only of late have there begun to be signs among the influential of a recognition that behind the *kerygma* it is possible to perceive (even if dimly) a figure—and that, the same figure as the *kerygma* proclaims; and that the Jesus of history and the Lord of faith are, after all, one. It is the merit of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns that he boldly anticipated this conclusion. It is the demerit of this book, if one may venture to criticize, that some of the "working" by which it reached this conclusion was shaky.

Small and unpretentious as was the book, it has been deservedly influential. It appeared in 1931, shortly before Kittel's *theologisches Wörterbuch* began to come out, and before the more notable of C. H. Dodd's New Testament works had been published. Much the same conclusion, admittedly, had long before been ably defended in England, as a friend points out to me. In *Jesus and the Gospel* (1908) James Denney, searching every stratum of the New Testament for the most primitive portrait of Jesus, reached the conclusion: "When we look back from the Christian religion . . . to the historical Jesus, we see a Person, who is not only equal to the place which Christian faith assigns him, but who assumes that place naturally and spontaneously as his own" (374). And in the following year, at least Scott Holland's essay, in the mainly very radical symposium published in a Hibbert Journal Supplement (*Jesus or Christ?* 1909), concluded: "His reality as Jesus in the flesh is the measure of his capacity to be the Christ" (135).

But much critical water had flowed under the bridge in the ensuing decades; and *The Riddle* was thus almost, if not quite, the only up-to-date attempt, in England, to grasp this nettle whose sting perennially irritates the academic skin—the nettle of the relation between "the Jesus of history" and "the Lord of faith". The German scholars who, long before this, had elaborated their studies in "form-criticism", had until then heard little or no contemporary sound from our side of the Channel of any attempt to assess the resulting situation. B. S. Easton's admirable little study, *The Gospel before the Gospels*, which had come across the Atlantic by 1928, seems to have aroused less notice than it deserved; and in any case was less theological in its aim. "Hoskyns and Davey" thus struck a reverberant note in England, and the second edition (1936) was translated into German in 1938. In fact *The Riddle* turned out to be, for the period between the wars, a pioneer work. The editor of the German edition declared that there was no other book which described the state of

New Testament scholarship after a century of historical research so comprehensively and impressively.

It achieved its end without (I think) so much as a single allusion to form-criticism. To read it one might imagine that Sir Edwyn was innocent of this technique. Indeed, perhaps one of the reasons for its success and influence was its admirable economy of effort and freedom from tiresome footnotes or references to predecessors, and its concentration on presenting the main theme in a lucid and readable manner for the non-specialist. But deeper reasons, no doubt, were the freshness of mind and the latent passion with which its convictions were presented. It was the work of one who had himself been fairly taken by storm.

Its main thesis can be quickly summarized in its own words. "The riddle is a theological riddle, which is insoluble apart from the solution of an historical problem. What was the relation between Jesus of Nazareth and the Primitive Christian Church?" (14); or: "The question is whether these documents (of the New Testament) do more than bear witness to the life of the Primitive Church. Do they also bear witness to Jesus of Nazareth?" (288). The answer to this riddle, this question, is this: "The further the critic is able to dig into the tradition, the more clearly is the Christology seen to be one single Christology expressed in terms of Son of Man and Son of God" (162); "at no point is the literary or historical critic able to detect in any stratum of the Synoptic material evidence that a Christological interpretation has been imposed upon an un-Christological history" (207); so, "to lay bare this uniform nature, this background, is to discover the Jesus of History" (249); "this book has been written to show that the documents (of the New Testament) do bear unmistakable witness to (Jesus), and that they are otherwise in the end unintelligible" (288).

The argument was simple: try where you will, test whatever stratum you like—the result is the same: not a mere teacher of morals, but a sublime person working to an Old Testament pattern, one whose ministry can only adequately be described in terms of a predetermined divine plan. Great emphasis is laid on this being the result of careful, critical sifting, with the use of all the available instruments of textual criticism, philology, and archaeology.

Unfortunately, however, there are parts of the alleged evidence which, to the critical reader, seemed at the time, and seem still more to-day, to be much too glib. As Kümmel says, "many of the historical theses advanced by Hoskyns are very vulnerable" (*das neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (1958) 519); and he instances Hoskyns' assumptions about the basic importance of the Suffering Servant concept, and about messianic claims attaching to each stratum of the material. Many readers, too, are likely to feel acute discomfort at the presentation of Jesus as consciously modelling his life on the Old Testament: ". . . was it that . . . he went to his death consciously in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, and ordered his ministry to that end?" (98); "Jesus acted as he did act and said what he did say because he was consciously ful-

filling a necessity imposed upon him by God through the demands of the Old Testament" (160). It is possible to be deeply convinced that Jesus, walking at every step in accordance with his Father's will, did in fact trace in its perfection that pattern of God's dealings with his People which was roughly adumbrated in the Scriptures, without entertaining this dreadful, this seemingly almost literalistic conception of the use of the Old Testament by the Lord. There are also some unfortunate moments in the critical assumptions of the book. The Fourth Gospel is declared *certainly* to have used Mark (101, 284); the "Proto-Luke" theory is described (17) as rendered untenable by J. M. Creed (which is a questionable assertion); and it is not reassuring to the reader looking for reasoned opinions to be told, on the same page, that "the definite ascription of (Ephesians) to St Paul is, of course, doubtful. But it seems legitimate to use it . . . as accurately representing what he had said or written". Again, some of the alleged Old Testament echoes employed to show that a New Testament passage was intended to be "messianically" understood are far-fetched. In a word, the details of the evidence, in an argument which begins with every show of putting all the cards on the table for the honest inquirer, are sometimes too glibly used.

But however well justified a critic then—and still more now—might be in calling for much more elaborate care in handling evidence which is twice as complex as this book suggests, the fact remains that the general direction in which the argument moved was ahead of its times then and seems to be more than ever coming into its own now. Like the inspired guess of a discoverer, it may have reached its conclusion before displaying adequate proof; but, although the present-day critic may be further than ever from being able to prove it, the complex bits of evidence in his laboriously assembled heap do help cumulatively to substantiate very much this conclusion. And it remains not only a far more readable book than most, but better than many for putting into the hands of an inquirer. It was a good stroke to make it a paper-back.

C. F. D. Moule.

---

## *Letter from South Africa*

# What is the African Ordinand Thinking?

Recent disturbances in South Africa have shown that there is a great gap in understanding between the races, for those who are charged with the duty of maintaining peace a dangerous failure in intelligence, for Christians a shocking lack of sympathy. There are people who a short time ago were prepared to ignore African opinion as of no account who now suspect that the viewpoint of the average African is going to have the final word in the emergence of a new South Africa. There are those who once despised his judgments who now suspect that he is inscrutable. Has the African really got something up his sleeve? What does he really think about race? In par-

ticular, what of the Christian African? Will he be impelled by his race into nationalist sympathies, or restrained by his religion into opposition to all forms of political expression, or hopelessly divided?

These are questions to which a simple answer cannot be given. But a recent examination paper set at St Bede's Theological College, Umtata, provided an opportunity at least for pursuing these questions further. The students were asked to imagine that they were given the chance to ask five questions of the Archbishop of Cape Town at his Visitation. Some few men chose to concentrate on the Archbishop's private impressions of South Africa and comparisons between his previous, and his present, spheres of work. The majority, however, caught the spirit of the exercise and subjected him to a searching analysis that covered the fields of religion and politics in a manner both responsible and at the same time completely sincere.

The preliminary attempt to classify these questions suggests that the African mind is closer to the Medieval than to the Modern. It proves impossible to distinguish clearly political from religious questions: Church and State are twin props of the social order, each symbolizing the fatherhood of the White man. And the real logical scandal for an African is the wide difference between them, a difference which he is disposed to see as the hypocritical gap between preaching and practice. The young man who wants to know *What is the best government policy over the next ten years?* seems to have an underlying conviction that an Archbishop is a statesman who has more immediate influence over the politicians than public exhortation and rebuke, that the solution of our political problems depends upon nothing more than a sincere effort by the White leaders of the Church to implement the second great commandment. This viewpoint frequently recurs. *How can we promote unity and peace and love between the two races in South Africa?* But the questioner does not mean exactly what he says, for no word or conscience of the uncharity of Africans appears. He goes on to be perfectly explicit in his explanation: *One race is exercising its power upon the other; the other is resisting against the power of their authorities.* And this he freely compares with the slavery that Wilberforce gave his life to overcome: *unless the Church fights for the freedom people would hardly believe what benefit is the Church to them —otherwise it will be regarded as an enemy.* Naïve, certainly, but important, for it shows that an African cannot do his duty as a Christian and forget politics. It is as a Christian and through the Church that he must agitate and fight.

Why then did four or more students ask the question in one form or another—*Is it right for a priest to interfere in politics?* Not because they saw any clear distinction between them, for the same students assert the duty of the Christian leaders to oppose unchristian acts of government: *South Africa is one of those countries which profess the Christian faith . . . but does not put into effect the principles of the Christian faith.* The explanation is rather the dilemma imposed upon African clergy by racial disturbances: *If a priest sides with the government, he is in danger from other Africans;*

*if he sides with the people, he faces a great danger of being deported or suppressed under the Suppression of Communism Act.* And this choice would not be so embarrassing to an African if he could distinguish clearly between Christianity and White South Africa.

There is then, to sum up, no great difference in the mind of the African ordinand between White leadership in Church and State. In both the Christian Faith is on trial, for Christianity is still a White religion which is being assimilated by Africans in much the same way as White enterprise and White culture. He sees the State as the great White leader whose pretensions are the official teaching of the Church and whose administrative policies are the fruits by which the Church's sincerity is to be judged.

The same narrow, medieval outlook appears in the questions that deal with racial discrimination within the Church itself. *Why do we have a Coloured Church, European Church, Indian Church, Chinese Church, and an African Church in the same town?* Another complains that *Whites are confirmed alone and Blacks alone.* Most social and institutional reformers are prepared to give cursory notice to the facts of history and geography, but not the African. The problem is established in his mind as a personal and a moral one: *Why should not the Church show a good example to the State and to the public? The State will not change while the Church is clinging hard to segregation.* One enthusiast does face certain difficulties. *Is it not time that the Church trained theological students at the same college?* he asks, and goes on to admit the superior intellectual qualifications of most European entrants. He mentions only to dismiss with scorn the idea that the Church is deliberately giving her non-European candidates an inferior training. But for him the question is decided by the importance of both races learning to understand each other's minds—so that non-Europeans can be given charge of European congregations. For this too is evidently a sore point. And no hint of the responsibility enters the question; it is a matter simply of racial justice: *Why should an African not be allowed to work among Europeans and hear their confessions, since we confess to our European fathers?* And another asks *Why are Africans not made priest-in-charge over Europeans?* It used to be thought that the African priest, like the African peasant, was a contented, even indolent, fellow, quite without ambition, content or rather delighted to serve in the subordinate positions of the Church, glad to repose upon the responsibility of his European superior. It used to be thought that the African's natural vanity did not extend to imagining that he could run things or run them as well as a White man. If it was ever justifiable to entertain such suppositions it is so no longer. The African ordinand has noticed the strange logic of appointing a young priest *fresh from England* to be priest-in-charge over experienced African assistants; he may be pardoned for discovering the explanation not in the miraculous fitness of the untried European but in the racial disqualification of the experienced African.

On equal pay for all clergymen our ordinand is less medieval and more open-minded. If Europeans are *more expert,* more pay is fair, but

are they? *They both attended theological colleges and were taught the same faith.* Does the European incur heavier expenses, in the education of his children, for example? Plainly the African thinks not. Boarding school costs him less, but he has usually more children at school. It is the same questioner, an unmarried man let us admit, who inquires whether African as well as European clergy cannot be given educational grants for all their children who could profit by them. That these are grievances rather than genuine questions need not deter us. They indicate that the world in which the African priest was delighted with a peasant's income provided he could do the Lord's work is no more.

It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that all or most of the questions were grievances, whatever their justification. The largest group asked dealt with Christian reunion, no less than ten out of thirty-one students asking one or more questions about it. The African ordinand is intensely aware of the Church as yet another subtle metaphysical fiction. For there is no Church; there is only the multiplication of voices and messages competing as much for the converted as for the heathen. The heathen *will not easily be converted as long as the different churches are fighting for superiority and competing for others' converts.* He feels the weakness of such division in preventing the presentation of a common Christian viewpoint to our society: *Why does the Church not unite and explain the whole affair to the Government?* One blames the conservatism of the laity: *We and the Protestant ministers do unite and speak well, but our congregations and theirs do not see eye to eye.* Several are clearly impatient of delay: *It is difficult to know why reunion is not possible in the Church, especially where there is no difference in teaching . . .* or only *a slight difference in doctrine and ceremonial.* Another is even more intolerant of the disunion itself: *the split of churches was caused by certain people with perverse minds and by people who were positional-minded.* The African ordinand feels deeply the sin and scandal of division, the suspicion and even hatred of one Christian denominational group for another. He cannot accept unquestioningly the imported theological reasons for these imported divisions. His Christianity is not a personal preference among many acceptable alternatives but the one deliverance from heathenism.

Consequently it is the exclusiveness of the Roman obedience that most perturbs him. *I would like to know whether we Catholics are anything inferior to the Roman Catholics,* says one. *They have always worried me saying that our orders of ministry are not valid, but only theirs. What is meant by the name Pope?* exclaims another. *I fail to understand why our Lord Jesus was not called Pope,* and *Peter who was entrusted with the heavenly keys was never called Pope.* Another is worried because *an Anglican priest once at St Bede's now has joined the Roman Catholics.* He fears that *This will open a leakage to Roman Catholicism.* No doubt this unreasoning fear of Rome is yet another European import into South Africa, but what chiefly concerns our ordinand is the barrier that Rome presents to Christian co-operation and unity: *Peter was just a chief apostle among equals,*

not *a visible head of the Church in place of our Lord.* The same writer proceeds: *the Church that is supposed to be one is split up into many denominations, some of which are too stubborn to . . . come together and form one body of Christ.*

After reunion the largest number of questions dealt with problems of evangelizing the heathen. What obviously troubles the consciences of our ordinands almost as much as the spectacle of disunion between Christians of different races and different denominations for whom Christ died is the complacent existence of Christian enclaves and Christian competition in a predominantly heathen country. *The majority just never care to be Christian. They live among the Christians. But they hold firmly to heathen customs.* This seems to our ordinands *very shameful.* Christianity is so much a deliverance from evil, superstition, error, and fear, that it is incredible that a man should actually prefer to be a heathen. Our ordinand is forced to seek a suitable reason for this heathen stubbornness. One finds it in the conservatism or lethargy of the Church: *the churches will only settle where there are some Christians. Heathen villages are neglected.* We are not *preaching in the villages from corner to corner as the old-time missionaries did.* Another would like to reach the heathen by more modern methods of contact and suggests agriculture for this purpose. Another deplores the obscurantism of heathen headmen. The majority, however, believes that the chief difficulty is the now widespread idea that Christianity is a White religion. For a heathen to become a Christian it means *leaving his customs and following the White man's customs.* Worse, Christianity is *the White man's weapon.* There is something of the Marxist view of religion here. Religion is the instrument of government, of White supremacy; it is generally supposed to have been *a clever teaching not instituted by God* but by the Whites *for their own advantage.* This suspicion is both a barrier to evangelism and a temptation to Christians to revert to heathenism.

The opportunity has thus been given for the African to make a frank assessment of Christianity. How much of it is catholic and divine, how much European or English? African national feeling has gone back to the consolations of heathenism. Is there a place for these things within Christianity? For, if so much Christianity is in European dress, Africans are wondering just where the Body ends and the clothing begins. In particular, polygamy. *I have conversed with some of* (the heathen) says one, *and I found that they want to be baptized, but what holds them back is polygamy.* This questioner does not doubt the divine law of monogamy but the justice and wisdom of its present application. *Can the Church deny the man baptism seeing that he took many wives before the Church came or before he was converted?* Another asks, *How can we persuade our people that monogamy is the will of God?* with the implication that he himself is not so perfectly convinced of the logical proof that this is God's command, and his fellow men still less so. Another is bold to criticize the Church's charity: *The Church closes its doors to the women who were married by custom and so became polygamist. They*

*definitely want to become Christians, but to leave their husbands nobody would support them.* Others criticize the policy of accepting the favourite wife and the husband for baptism while insisting that other wives must be put away together with the children towards whom the polygamist incurred duties and obligations of honour in good faith before he became a Christian convert.

Polygamy is, of course, only an ephemeral problem. There are other African customs that our ordinands think the Church was unwise to reject out of hand. *The Church found us with our own customs. Some of them were bad, but some good. For example, in the past we used to wear skins, or amabeshu. The Church insisted that a man should put on a pair of trousers. If I put on a skin now people will say that I have deserted the Church and become a heathen. What is Christianity? Is it dress or a spiritual thing?* It used to be thought that African people regarded European customs as emancipation from barbarism. It does not seem to be true of what our ordinands are thinking now. For the witchdoctor still has his following that is not entirely superstitious: *the Church said that we should not consult witchdoctors because they are wicked. But our people say that they* (Herbalists) *were ordained by God to heal the sick. Is it good to suspend all those who believe in Bantu doctors since they say that they too were ordained by God?*

Undoubtedly, though, the most pressing problem that faces our ordinands is the revival of the cult of ancestor-worship. Because the African does not distinguish clearly between Christian and White man he tends to judge Christianity by the behaviour of the average White man he meets, *so they see no good thing in being a Christian.* But resurgent African national feeling has revived the one consoling practice of African religion, the communication with God through the mediation of the ancestors. Thus *we are fast losing our church members who either hold both ancestor worship and Christianity or just turn their backs on Christianity. People are now going backwards, not only in the Church but also in other denominations.*

The questions revealed a good deal of reflexion about marriage, in contrast with the commonly accepted opinion that African marriage is largely economic and devoid of deeper meaning. *What time is it advisable for a young priest to be married?* For he needs a wife for company, but *he is still learning to be a priest* and that would be more difficult *with a wife to study.* Another student is concerned about divided families: *Is not the Church working against Scripture when it allows separation* (of man and wife)? For *man and woman are one when they are married, and these may fall into temptation when they are separated.* Another shows how deep, if not how salutary, is the influence of the priest's home: *Is it necessary for the* (African) *clergy to marry? Because most clergy are occupied and getting troubles at home;* worry interferes with their work; and *some celebrate masses in anger, not free, because of their domestic affairs.* The same student is perturbed by the monstrous regiment of women: *What is the position of the priests' wives in the parishes? They always tend to occupy the best positions as leaders, pretending to*

*know, although they are ignorant. . . . Above all they cause quarrels due to their interference in Church affairs.*

How does the African ordinand regard his own future ministry? It is said that he is not naturally much of a pastor, and it is true that only a small proportion of the questions are about people, or about the clergyman as shepherd, or stem from zeal and love. But there are some. *Our young men and young women have neglected their duty to God. Does the Church do its work properly in setting out the truth before them?* for *each day the Church loses a teenager.* Another worry is the heavy drinking that spoils so many Christian characters and ruins a priest's good example. One student wonders whether the Church is sufficiently aware of this danger and repentant of its evil. Another is concerned that so many priests seem to have lost contact with their people. He wants to receive advice on *the essential character of a good priest . . . how to secure the co-operation of his congregation*; how to be a leader rather than a dictator. Another wonders whether it is diocesan or parochial policy that *the outstation churches,* although contributing equally with others, *should be built in so miserable a manner.* Another wishes to know *what are the most hindrances to an ordained minister?* and confesses disarmingly *because I would like to fight and conquer all the blemishes that spoil our good work.* Yet another would like to see homes provided for pensioned African clergy.

Perhaps it is natural, however, that the African should be more concerned about the low academic standard of the African clergy. *Why is the three years at theological college not increased to at least four years?* Even more trenchant is the indictment of those already ordained: *How can the present clergy be made to desire to raise their standard since the majority never care to study after they have got their collars?* And for good measure *They abhor manual labour, they think that it is a disgrace to see a priest doing his manual work. I see no way of the Church growing up so long as the clergy are semi-literate and semi-educated.* The deacon with parochial experience sees it differently: *Why is it that African clergy are not allowed to continue their study after the end of their theological course? They should be allowed at least six months a year to write an examination on what they are given to study in addition to practical work.* One man wonders whether four theological colleges, *three of them in the Cape Province,* are sufficient for the needs of so great a Province. For *Congregations are increasing and the number of candidates completing* (their training) *is inadequate.* Yet another realizes the great responsibility that rests upon the lay preachers of the Church *because of the great shortage of priests,* and thinks it *advisable to have some form of theological training* for them. Because *The Church is faced with many religious sects, most of them heretical, who victimize the Church by their easy ways of worship,* and usually it is the lay *catechists who are working among these heretics all by themselves.*

The questions reveal the African ordinand as necessarily narrow in outlook, ignorant like Thomas of all that he has not actually seen, medieval in his approach to politics and the Bible, yet almost aggres-

sively independent in judgment. Within the field of his experience, which includes the heights and the depths of Christianity, he is not to be shaken from his personal convictions. Where the European falls below his own professed standard he is able to judge him by it and, better than the European, he knows it. And he is turning away from European Christianity and looking for a more characteristically African expression of his religion. I cannot doubt that Christianity and South Africa will be the stronger for it.

DAVID CATON.

---

## Studies in Texts

### THE OTHER OF THE TWO: A fresh look at John 1. 35 ff.

"ONE of the two which heard Jesus speak, and followed him, was Andrew" (John 1. 40). Who was the other? Tradition universally says it was the Evangelist himself, in self-effacing anonymity, and every commentator who has attempted to identify this un-named disciple has (with greater or less confidence) taken him to be John.[1]

The only argument in favour of this which relies entirely on the evidence of the fourth Evangelist is the one which adopts the variant reading *protos* (found in ℵ) in 1. 41 and takes the phrase *ton adelphon ton idion* in that verse to have an emphatic force. We then paraphrase thus: "Both of these two had brothers; Andrew was the first to find *his*, whilst the other was still looking."

Of this argument, Bernard (in the I.C.C. volume on John) says that if this is what was intended, it is very obscurely expressed, and Lagrange treats the whole theory as *un peu trop subtil*. It is hard to see it as anything else but a desperate attempt to wrest John's text to agree with the Synoptists, where the first disciples are called in the order Simon, Andrew, James and John. Even at this it is not very successful, for Luke never mentions the call of Andrew at all and Mark and Matthew have the two pairs of brothers called at the same time.

Once, however, we free ourselves from the attempt to harmonize John and the Synoptics, we can let the fourth Gospel speak for itself and find a far more plausible answer to our question.

In John 1. 41 we take the better reading *proton* and translate "the first thing Andrew did was to find his brother". *Idios* in New Testament times was merely a possessive pronoun and not necessarily emphatic. Now look at the verses under consideration.

Verses 35–39 tell of two disciples encountering Jesus; vv. 40–42 are

---

[1] The following in their commentaries say definitely, probably or possibly that he was John: Barrett (poss.), Dods (prob.), Henderson, Hoskyns, Lagrange (prob.), Loisy (the Beloved Disciple "in an ideal sense"), McClymont, MacGregor (if pressed), Nolloth, Plummer, Strachan (prob.), Temple, Tholuck, Westcott, Wright, Zahn.

So far as I can find, no other person has been considered as a candidate for the honour by the commentators.

about Andrew who was one of them; it is therefore natural to see vv. 43 ff. as recounting the story of the other, who was Philip. He came from the same town as Andrew, with whom he is associated elsewhere in the fourth Gospel. More cautious than his compatriot, he goes away to think things over during the following day, whilst Simon is being brought to Jesus; but the next day our Lord himself seeks him out and convinces him.

To see Philip as this unnamed disciple of John Baptist is in accordance with his character as the fourth Evangelist elsewhere paints it. He is a slow-moving person. He sees snags before he sees possibilities. When Jesus wants to feed the crowd and asks him where bread can be got, his immediate reaction is "it would cost over two hundred denarii to give them a scrap apiece" (6. 5 ff.). He does not like to take action on his own initiative. Some Greeks want to be introduced to Jesus, but he will not take it upon himself to risk interrupting the Master. So he tells Andrew, his fellow-townsman, and they go together (12. 20 ff.). When he does use his initiative to evangelize, he is not equal to argument, which he short-circuits with an appeal to "come and see" (1. 46). His slower mind is easily puzzled. He cannot follow the subtleties of the discourse in the Upper Room, and interjects with his request to "show us the Father, and we shall be satisfied" (14. 8).

The only argument against seeing Philip as the other of the two in John 1. 40 is that built on the Moffatt translation. This takes it that 1. 19–42 belongs to "Bethany on the opposite side of the Jordan" and that Philip was called later in Galilee. To put this construction on the text, v. 43 needs to be translated "Next day Jesus determined to leave for Galilee; there he met Philip". *There* does not appear in the Greek, and MacGregor in the Moffatt commentary confesses that "the sudden transference of the scene . . . is a little strange". A fairer paraphrase is "Next day Jesus determined to leave for Galilee; before he left (or even as he set out) he looked out Philip (whom he had previously seen with Andrew)".

Such a supposition explains the apparent suddenness of Philip's call, agrees with his cautious temperament, and provides the other half of the story for which the phrase "one of the two" is crying out.

MICHAEL C. PERRY.

---

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Martin Cooper is Rector of King's Stanley, Stonehouse, Glos.

The Rev. H. M. J. Banting is Rector of Teversham, Cambridge.

The Rev. C. F. D. Moule is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. David Caton is Vice-Principal of St Bede's College, Umtata, C.P., South Africa.

The Rev. M. C. Perry is Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## CAN WE RATIONALIZE THE CHRISTIAN YEAR?

SIR,

Both your correspondents raise points of exactly the sort which I hoped my article might evoke. I was concerned only to raise the issue, and to offer some constructive suggestions for reform. Mr Kaye and Fr Bouyer may be right, but as soon as the Church began to make any "commemorations" (even Lent, Ascension and Pentecost), she was in some degree committed. After repeated re-reading I find Fr Bouyer's attitude to the "commemorative" side of the Christian Year far from clear. In any case, the question is whether our present arrangements cannot be improved.

The investigations, which Mr Davies mentions, into the history of the present plan of the Propers of the Roman Liturgy (which are not identical with our own) are a fascinating subject for scholars. But there can be a grave danger of *archaeologisme* unless we ask ourselves whether that history, when uncovered, will help us to a more vital worship for to-day. Perhaps it will—or perhaps not.

I am grateful to Mr Thorne for correcting in your February issue my careless error in attributing the Collect of Advent III to Cranmer instead of Cosin.

Yours faithfully,
HENRY, KNARESBOROUGH.

---

## PARISH "REFUGEES"

DEAR SIR,

Excellent advice is frequently given in books and periodicals to ministers and lay church officials on how to deal with parishioners who are "difficult", "impossible to co-operate with", "lacking in moral integrity", etc., but I have never yet come across any advice to distracted parishioners on how to deal with an incumbent of this nature. Unfortunately, this problem does exist in a few parishes, and can give rise to a great deal of perplexity concerning the truly Christian course of action. This is particularly true where the worshippers are parochial (e.g. in a village or small town) rather than congregational.

When one genuinely feels, after every prayerful effort has been made, that worship, in the true sense, becomes impossible in one's parish church, is one justified in seeking spiritual help and guidance from another church and another priest? Or should one continue attending one's "own church" irrespective of the vagaries and outrageous conduct of the parish priest? Often those who take the first course of action find themselves severely criticized by the second category for "deserting the church". But the crucial question here surely is "What do we mean by 'the Church'?" Could it ever be regarded as a Christian duty to sacrifice the spiritual benefits of devout participation in Holy Communion and other services in

order to try to keep alive the activities of a parish, keep the finances going, repair the fabric, etc? Or is this rather like attempting to keep alive the leaves and blossom of a plant when the root is quickly withering? The exercise of Christian charity towards the difficult incumbent is sometimes urged, but there are surely occasions when the exercise of what might be called extreme Christian charity towards an individual may do lasting and untold harm to a community.

How much allegiance does one owe to a church building and organization when it can no longer be said to house a real worshipping community? It is frequently those to whom worship, and especially the Holy Communion, means the most who are the first to realize the impossibility of attendance at a particular church. Those who only attend spasmodically sometimes pride themselves on a "more tolerant attitude", and are loud in their denunciation of those who "don't stick to their own church". On the other hand, there are probably a certain number of very regular and sincere worshippers who maintain their determination "to hang on for the sake of the church"—whatever that may mean in terms of deep spiritual values. A few earnest church members miserably drag themselves to church Sunday by Sunday because they feel that if once the congregation all drift away to other parishes it will become impossible, when the reign of tyranny is ended, to reassemble the "diaspora" once more.

For office holders in the church it is clearly an even more agonizing problem, and one in which the "consult your parish priest" advice is hardly helpful. The mission secretary, for example, may well feel that his or her resignation may mean the withdrawal of support for various missionary societies.

One of the worst tragedies of such a situation, however, is its effect on individual character and conduct. Feelings run high, and bitterness of spirit takes the place of acting together in Christian fellowship. Devout churchmen are suddenly horrified to find themselves, against their better nature, on the point of wishing the incumbent would commit a legal crime and thus be ejected from the living. Much energy and time is wasted in abortive criticism, and discussion of church affairs tends to descend to a series of explosions of righteous indignation rather than positive planning in a spirit of humility and service.

Neighbouring clergy are willy nilly dragged into the arena, and are faced with the problem of the "refugees" in their midst. Should they send them back to their own parish to try to sort out the situation? But sometimes the situation seems quite insoluble unless the parish were composed entirely of those who effectively combine sanctity with expert psychological knowledge. The congregations in our churches are not composed of saints or psychologists—only of individuals with ordinary human frailties who look to their parish priest for guidance and inspiration Sunday by Sunday.

Yours faithfully,

"Reuben".

## "LADY CHATTERLEY"

DEAR SIR,

Your contributor, the Rev. D. W. Foster, reads "Lady Chatterley" very differently from myself. To me it is a spurious book, false, not true to life. While its publication was pending, one hoped that it might be a valuable achievement—the sort of book that is still waiting to be written—a book in which it was shown that physical intimacy with complete abandon, so sordid and degrading if pursued for its own sake, and repulsive if one-sided, can nevertheless be purified, transformed and raised to a supernatural level when engaged in by two persons deeply in love with one another.

"Lady Chatterley" is not such a book. It underdescribes, rather than overdescribes, the delights of sexual play and intercourse. There is the humbling not-worthy sense of wonder, satisfaction and joy at the total trustful giving and receiving of body and soul that are sought and accepted on both sides. There is the tender, protective, even mother feeling of the woman towards her man. Also there is always, where the fullest union takes place, the awful knowledge that another life may result, with the prolonged responsibilities that that will entail. That other life will be a living merger of the two present selves. Of these things Lawrence knows nothing. The persons in his book are dummies without character. They promiscuously and impetuously rush into sexual intercourse. The story is but a framework for detailed descriptions of impulsive, animal behaviour unredeemed by love.

What might have been beautiful is nothing but obscene. For good measure, but for no sort of useful purpose, obscene words are trailed before our consciousness. One feels that one's nose is being rubbed in dirt.

Sex is indeed for Lawrence a religious activity. He bows down and worships it. He knows no higher god. If young people suppose that the book is describing what they are going to experience and ought to experience, they are being deceived. Sex is, or should be, a far finer thing than Lawrence has any knowledge of. "Lady Chatterley" is a tragic book, unpleasant to read, apparently written by a madman tormented by an obsession with the physical side of sex.

Yours faithfully,

K. C. SCOTT.

MIDSOMER NORTON VICARAGE,
BATH.

Mr Foster writes: "Mr Scott and I do not read 'Lady Chatterley' altogether differently, in that I can go part of the way with some of his assertions. I almost regret reference, in an article of wider intention, to such a vulnerable novel, exhibiting, for a Christian moralist, deficiencies which were not glossed over in my article!

"Lawrence, however, is just not the man of straw above set up for demolition. What, no 'tender, protective, even mother feeling of the woman towards her man'? The projected title 'Tenderness' could be justified. And no 'awful knowledge that another life may result'?

Well, it does—and the parents are glad. As for promiscuity, sex for its own sake, and other attitudes Mr Scott castigates, they are depicted and *judged* within the novel. For rebuttal of several accusations, one might focus on pp. 258, 259 (celebrated Penguin edition).

"We cannot hang an iron curtain across human behaviour, labelling one side 'sordid and degrading', animal and instinctive; while the other is 'spiritual and supernatural'. I still dare believe that Lawrence has some 'knowledge of' sex as existential truth—neither the category of 'physical' nor 'spiritual' will suffice—and some skill in communicating the mystery of the relationship."

---

## WORKER PRIESTS

Dear Sir,

I was most appreciative of your reviewer's comments on the symposium *Work* (Darton, Longman and Todd) in your issue for February. But I should like one matter cleared up if possible. He says that the contribution on "Worker Priests" side-steps the problem by ignoring the evidence from France. This implies a certain dishonesty on the part of myself, doubly responsible for this contribution, as both author of it, and editor of the whole book. I would like to know what the reviewer refers to, both as to "the problem", and "the evidence". I thought I had put down, briefly indeed, the essence of the problem, and I intended to take full account of the evidence at the time of printing, April 1960! So his comment is a shock.

Yours,
John M. Todd.

The Rev. M. J. Jackson writes: "I suspected Mr Todd, not of dishonesty, but of discretion, because the decision of the Vatican to stop the French worker priests was controversial. His short chapter on the worker priests, which gives $3\frac{1}{2}$ out of its 6 pages to the Little Brothers, leaves little room for the secular worker priests. The problem of the worker priests—the missionary situation which they tried to meet, their aims and intentions and the reasons for their recall—is set out in the personal documents of Loew, Perrin, Godin, *The Worker Priests,* and in secondary sources like A. Dansette, *Destin du Catholicisme Français, 1926–1956.* A thorough study of the implications of the French priest workers for a theological understanding of the world of work and for the mission of the Church, clerical and lay, in industrial society would be useful, now that distance from 1954 leads to objectivity. Perhaps Mr Todd's publishing house would commission such a study, although I believe another firm has in hand a translation from the French of some recent essays on the worker priest movement."

---

*The Editor will be unable to attend to correspondence from April 4 to 18.*

# BOOK REVIEWS

AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGIOUS SOCIOLOGY. By F. Boulard. Translation and Introduction to English Edition by M. J. Jackson. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 21s.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW MONOGRAPH NO. 3: MORAL ISSUES IN THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS. Ed. by Paul Halmos. University College of North Staffordshire. 1960. 12s.

The Rev. Michael Jackson has translated *Premiers Itinéraires en Sociologie Religieuse* and has thereby rendered good service to the cause of religious sociology in the English-speaking world. The first edition of Canon Boulard's book appeared in Paris in 1954. It immediately became an important and popular introduction to a form of study which has subsequently made its mark on the thinking and policy of the French Church. That religious sociology has become an accepted technique in mission work is in large measure due to Canon Boulard, but also to the intellectual father of the movement, Professor Gabriel Le Bras, who has contributed the introduction to the book. He saw the value of the research in the early 1930s. His plea for a scientific analysis of the place of the Church in contemporary society became all the more urgent by reason of the growing awareness, during the Second World War, of the alienation of the working classes from the French Church, which gave rise to such steps to remedy the situation as the priest-workers (now abandoned) and the *Mission de France*. Canon Boulard's book is basically a simple handbook offering, on the one part, some results of sociological surveys and, on the other, methods that can be used in pursuing the kinds of surveys he and others have undertaken. His most outstanding achievement has been in the production of the now-famous map of religious practice in rural France, a good-sized copy of which is provided with the book. He divided France into three types of areas according to the relative strength of outward observance and, though some might wish to quarrel with his selection of criteria, the importance of the map for academic and practical matters hardly needs stressing. Mr Jackson, in his useful introduction, shows that religious sociology as it has emerged is essentially concerned with a sociological analysis of the Church as an institution among other institutions. Religious sociology, unlike the sociology of religion, is not involved in the problem of the nature of religion or its value to society, rather it attempts to portray a precise picture of what is actually going on at the present time within the Church viewed as a social institution. Seen in this light, it is a tool, and a most necessary tool, for the Church in understanding itself. "In order to see clearly and to act realistically and so fulfil its mission, the Church, in the manner of a large industrial concern, must devote men, time and energy on an adequate scale to research and development" (p. xi). The time has come for the Anglican Church to learn from the initiative described in this book—an initiative which leaders of the churches on the Continent and elsewhere have had little hesitation in seizing. It is a book every theological student, pastor and bishop ought to read.

*The Sociological Review Monograph No.* 3 also deals with a frontier subject. In this case it is not the Church which is the centre of interest but the moral issues involved in the training of teachers and social workers. The *Review* consists of a number of papers and comments given by teachers of various disciplines at the Third Interprofessional Conference held recently at Keele. The dilemma that was posed by the Conference rested on the fact that the responsibilities of teachers and social workers are great because such people constantly give advice and shape the minds of those with whom they deal. Are those whose duty it is to train teachers and social workers fully aware of the situation? Are they able to help their students in giving direction on important moral issues? Can the moral philosopher give a lead? In answering these pertinent questions the writers of the papers worked over a lot of the old ground: ethics and psychology, "is" and "ought", fact and value, objectivity and commitment, sometimes refreshingly, sometimes unexcitingly. What was said was very much to the point, though the reviewer gained the impression that it was the social worker rather than the schoolteacher whose work came in for criticism. Is it true after all that the blind are leading the blind? Religion was discussed as well it might have been. For this reason and because the *Review* covers an area of growing importance it is to be commended to the educated and intelligent Christian. Those who found Lady Wootton's *Social Science and Social Pathology* stimulating will be pleased to know that some of her more provocative statements are taken up by the contributors, none of whom significantly is a don from Oxbridge.

W. F. S. Pickering.

St John's College,
Winnipeg.

---

The Book of Psalms, Revised, Rearranged and Adapted for use in Public and Private Worship as Christian Prayers and Praises. By R. D. Richardson. Published by the author at Boynton Rectory, Warminster, 1960. 4s. 6d. if obtained through a Bookseller, 3s. 6d., plus postage, if obtained direct from the author.

The fact that much of the Psalter as it is found in the Prayer Book is unsuitable for use in Christian worship has never been squarely faced, although the principle of necessary omissions was recognized in 1928, by the bracketing of a few verses. Canon Richardson has devoted immense pains to the production of this scholarly and devotional abridgement of the Psalter, seeking to provide a selection of Psalms, which shall include as much of the "Psalms of David" as can be sung *con animo* by a Christian congregation. He has rightly chosen to preserve as far as possible the beauties of Coverdale's translation, the lyric quality of which has so often been praised. Coverdale, however, does not always accurately represent the Hebrew text and Canon Richardson has corrected many mistranslations. Moreover, remembering that he is providing for the needs, not of students or even of general readers, but of a worshipping congrega-

tion, he has not hesitated to use conjecture to make plain passages which are difficult, because of the corruption of the original text or for other reasons. In some places he has retained Coverdale's mistranslations or even inserted modifications of his own, in order to "christianize" the doctrine of a psalm. As an example of this, we may note the change in Psalm 16. 11 from "thou shalt not leave my soul in hell" to "thou wilt not leave my soul in death"—which quite definitely brings in the Doctrine of Immortality. More often, however, this process of "christianization" is carried out by the omission of passages the teaching of which is sub-christian. A good many psalms, which are unsuitable for use as a whole, contain one or two verses of great value. These have sometimes been retained by including them in suitable contexts in other psalms. The needs of chanting have been carefully considered in the arrangement of the verses and the division of the psalms into stanzas, and the psalms are fully pointed on the "speech-rhythm" system. Finally, the whole psalter has been re-arranged under "subject-matter" headings, e.g. "Psalms of Praise", "Psalms of Aspiration", "Psalms of Trust", and the psalms have been renumbered. This arrangement would be helpful to anyone choosing psalms for a particular occasion, but it seems detrimental to the permanent use of the book in its present form for the Daily and Sunday Offices, where the psalms to be sung are necessarily prescribed by authority and in which at any one period there should be variety rather than uniformity of subject matter. At Morning or Evening Prayer it would usually be necessary to draw psalms from more than one of the sections of the book and the turning from one page to another would be inconvenient and distracting. However, this is a minor criticism of a work of great importance which deserves the closest consideration by those concerned with the revision and reassessment of the Prayer Book Psalter. Meanwhile, is it too much to hope that many parishes will obtain episcopal permission for the experimental use of this very reasonably priced book and thereby enable their people to sing the psalms easily and musically and, possibly for the first time, with fully intelligent devotion?

RUSSELL CLEGG.

BRADFORD.

---

ACCORDING TO MARK. By Philip Carrington. Cambridge University Press. 1960. 50s.

This commentary on Mark's gospel is by the author of *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (C.U.P., 1952), and in it Dr Carrington writes out in full the most recent development of his hypothesis, that the early Christian Church, in particular the community in Rome, took over the agricultural religious calendar of contemporary Palestinian Judaism; and that this calendar forms the framework of Mark's gospel. At the same time, Dr Carrington presents us with an often very readable, and almost as often quite exasperating, exegesis of the text. He writes from faith to . . . ? It is hard to tell quite for whom this book is intended. The dust-cover suggests "the serious

scholar" and "the intelligent student". The book presupposes so much that it can hardly be intended as a student's only book of reference on Mark's gospel; it seems to expect its most positive appreciation from those who have read the gospel with all the apparatus of critical study, and who have then not so much disagreed with the critics' conclusions as despaired altogether of their methods. It could hardly be used as an introduction to the gospel, for anyone; John the Baptist is described with no more information than could be culled from a concordance, and we are also expected to know what "The Didache" is; these are only minor details, but they express the general bias of the book, which is towards being a devotional commentary on other commentaries, rather than a commentary in its own right. But the technical details that *are* discussed, and the length (approx. 400 pp.), must necessarily limit its appeal, even among those who might use it meditatively.

I am not competent to judge the calendar hypothesis as such. (This is, roughly, that the divisions of the text of Mark in Vaticanus B, preserve the earliest Christian lectionary, 49 or 50 lections for the year, with two further blocks of material to be read at the seasons of Tabernacles and Passover-Easter. And Dr Carrington finds a certain amount of rather tenuous support for an early date for these divisions in some of the lection-divisions in other MSS). Fairly obviously, calendars were important to the Judaism contemporary with the compilation of this gospel. If the early Christians used such a calendar, which is possible, it is also possible that it provided the framework for this gospel. And some of Dr Carrington's findings are interesting; John the Baptist, by the B divisions, is mentioned exactly on the quarters. Once the proposed starting date, the week after Tabernacles, has been allowed, the "passion" of John also falls at Passover time. The parable of the sower comes at the appropriate time of the year; and there are other intriguing "coincidences"; so that for a moment it seems hard to see how calendar divisions that fit so neatly could be anything but "in-built". And then: Dr Carrington has to abandon B in the last 14 of the pre-Paschal divisions, and subdivide some of these to produce a tally of 28 all told, for the last part of the year, and the Tabernacle season. The hypothesis is interesting, and worth discussion, but not, I would suggest, yet sufficiently substantiated for it to be worth building a commentary round it.

But the calendar is not, of course, the main point of the book; that is to provide a "running commentary" (the sub-title) on the text. And here the author's critical views meet his subsidiary hypothesis in head-on collision. All the stories in Mark are supposed to bear unmistakable signs of the enrichments which only an eye-witness can provide; and the eye-witness is Peter. No proof of such eye-witness activity here or elsewhere in the writing down of the tradition of the early Church is offered, that would meet the objections stated by Professor D. E. Nineham in recent issues of *J.T.S.* But the chief logical weakness within the book itself is that while the details of the descriptions of events are supposed to show a lively interest

in the character of Jesus, and in the things that actually happened to him, the *order* of events is supposed to have been decided entirely by an artificial hieratic scheme, the calendar. Peter can add the odd note on roof-breaking, but not the gentlest protest: "No, that happened months later." Peter cannot even set Mark right on what happened at the Passion; and Mark can intimate clearly that the Last Meal was the Passover, when actually it was not; according to Dr Carrington. In fact, the author presupposes the fragmentation of the tradition that a style-analysis, a form-criticism of the tradition demonstrates, and does admit his indebtedness to this method at one point (p. 224); but rejects out of hand its further implications: "It was no community created them (the stories) because a community cannot create." And of the idea that the "Syro-Phoenician woman" is a pronouncement story of the early Church: "A great gulf divides us from this type of criticism" (pp. 156 ff.). So great a gulf that I doubt if the author has really understood the criticism at all. But the weirdest of legends about the woman's identity are worth noting. And there can be little more facile than the dismissal as "facile" of J. Jeremias (p. 296), for his treatment of the "advent" parables; the author does not even deign to elaborate a case against him. (And it should have been possible to include this name in the index, even if the reference were slighting). Again, it is decided that the story of the rich young man cannot be a pronouncement story, by the purely bourgeois canon that a command to poverty cannot be meant to apply to all Christians (p. 215)! I am sure that it should be possible to make Dr Carrington's case against the subjectivity of the use of form-analysis by some critics somewhat less subjectively.

Dr Carrington's writing is certainly lively; and for an instance his section on the possible background in the feast of booths of the Entry tradition and its Markan context is perceptive; though somewhat marred by the introduction of a totally undocumented folk-rite reminiscent of a rodeo. And purely as an aid to meditation, his evoking of Old Testament imagery is often almost lyrical; but he spoils this by refusing to see that if these patterns of imagery were there to shape the mind of the Lord, they were also there to shape the mind of the Church and its tradition later.

The question still remains, was it worth the while to produce a book of this length to elaborate a still-uncertain hypothesis; to combine this elaboration with a commentary that cannot claim to be more than a supplementary work for any serious scholar; and so probably to deter many who might have found the archbishop's meditation from the text of Mark a lively aid to prayer.

F. G. Downing.

Lincoln.

---

Anselm: Fides Quaerens Intellectum. By Karl Barth. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 25s.

The criterion by which any ancient work of theology should be judged is its vitality; that is to say, its ability to yield a fresh under-

standing of the faith when the categories in which it was originally presented have been superseded. If a work has permanent value, we may discard the formal shell with impunity, but underneath it we shall discover a kernel of positive content which holds good for our own generation.

St Anselm affords a striking example of this principle. In his day the newly-discovered science of formal logic provided the framework of all theological thinking, and his writings have the somewhat chilling air of a chain of necessary deductions from *a priori* premisses. However, just because we see the limitations of his method, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that he has nothing to say to us.

The Proof of God's Existence advanced in the first four chapters of *Proslogion* has habitually been called "ontological" (e.g. by Mascall, *He Who Is*, p. 31) and classed with the essays bearing that label by Descartes and Leibniz. This, says Barth with characteristic vigour, is "so much nonsense on which no more words ought to be wasted" (p. 171). Anselm was not trying to deduce the existence of God from *a priori* premisses of natural reason; such an attempt would be precisely that self-exaltation of the creature above the Creator against which Barth is always warning us. No, *Proslogion* is a theological treatise in the Barthian sense, i.e. it speaks from faith to faith. The saint begins and ends by professing his belief in the majesty and incomprehensibility of God, and prays for the light of the Holy Spirit that his faith may be completed by knowledge. "Theology is devout obedience" (p. 151).

What becomes, then, of the famous formula, *quo maius cogitari nequit* (than which nothing greater can be conceived)? This, says Barth, is a revealed Name of God. It has "noetic" but no "ontic" content; that is to say, it does not describe God in any way, it merely affords the necessary conceptual handle by which we can grasp his incomprehensibility (He is revealed as hidden.) It

> is designed to exclude just this conceivability of the non-existence or imperfection of God which lurks in the background of every ontic conception of God (p. 89).

The unfortunate Gaunilo (who gets short shrift from Barth, along with all Anselm's later critics, including St Thomas) fails entirely to see this, and his island analogy (in the *Liber pro Insipiente*) shows that he is still thinking in terms of an object, a *thing*, whose existence can only be demonstrated experimentally. The existence of God is not of this kind. He does indeed possess the existence which is common to creatures, but he possesses it in a unique way because he is the very ground and presupposition of all existence. In fact, his is "the only existence which can in the strict sense be proved" (p. 99).

It would be easy to criticize Barth's exposition on the ground that the distinction between natural and revealed theology was not as clearly drawn in the eleventh century as it was in the thirteenth. The formula *credo ut intelligam* can be taken as implying that faith is merely an inferior kind of knowledge; and it is by no means clear that Anselm was not tarred with this Averroist brush. Certainly he

was not an eleventh-century Barthian! But the formula *quo maius cogitari nequit* has a fecundity which transcends the barriers of formal logic; and Barth has done well to draw our attention to this fact.

Despite the excellence of Mr Robertson's translation, readers will often be grateful for the footnotes, where Anselm's Latin is often much more lucid than Barth's anglicized German. It is a pity that the proof-reading has not been done more carefully, e.g. the formula *quo maius*, etc., is incorrectly cited at the very beginning of Barth's exposition of *Proslogion* 2–4 on p. 73.

Robin Anstey.

Chichester Theological College.

---

The Monks of Qumran. By E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J. Burns and Oates. 1960. 30s.

Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. By F. F. Bruce. Tyndale Press. 1960. 5s.

A book about Qumran and its documents is doubly welcome when, like that of Fr Sutcliffe, it meets the conditions of being at once a clear, readable guide for the general reader and the expression of original opinions on some of the problems. Those already acquainted with the author's sane and lucid work in similar spheres will find their expectations fulfilled as they read an account which sees Qumran primarily as a religious community and which discusses their life, economic, social, devotional and disciplinary. This well justified approach makes natural a comprehensive account of the community, with translations of many of the documents and of relevant passages from Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder, a chronological summary, indices, illustrations and diagrams. No less interesting and important are the author's opinions: for example, the Teacher of Righteousness in about 160 B.C. developed the Qumran community into Essenes out of the movement of the *Hasidim* who had already been active twenty years. *Man. Disc.* 8.1–9.26 is the "first draft of the Qumran constitution and the first fifteen members" (twelve laymen and three priests) whom their leader chose as a firm foundation and in due time made them the nucleus of the community in the desert. This was the early history of the group: the fifteen are not a permanent inner council. This is an original theory and deserves careful examination, here dealt with more fully than in the article in the *Journal of Semitic Studies* (see the book, pp. 58 f. and note 5 on p. 254 f.). The Wicked Priest was probably Jonathan (160–142 B.C.), while the Lion of Wrath may have been Antiochus Epiphanes. In Chapter II, describing the site, Fr Sutcliffe makes good use of the work of Dr E. W. Gurney Masterman (father-in-law of the present Archbishop in Jerusalem) from 1900 to 1913 for the Palestine Exploration Fund. Dr Masterman's descriptions of Jerusalem in a guide now out of print and of the Dead Sea shore, especially at 'Ain Feshka (where the sea has since encroached on the oasis)

could be with advantage edited and reprinted. Altogether Fr Sutcliffe has brought out of his treasure things new and old; we are grateful for both.

Professor Bruce's monograph is slighter only in bulk: the sect's principles of biblical exegesis take us to the heart of the matter and understanding of them is essential to right interpretation of the available evidence. This book of eighty-eight pages gives the student an excellent lead if he approaches the Hebrew or English text for the first time after a general introduction: it shows him how his authors thought. The prophets gave their readers secrets (*razim*) each of which needed its complementary *pesher* to interpret it; the Teacher of Righteousness was especially gifted to supply these *pesharim* which show that the prophets referred to the time of the end, itself now at hand. The author is often illuminating, always lucid (he translates superbly) and goes only rarely beyond the evidence. On exegesis in the New Testament as compared with the scrolls, Professor Bruce writes well: as he says, christology is now added to eschatology; but the chapter on this subject reveals ultra-conservative positions with regard to the authorship of New Testament books contrasting strangely with his acceptance of the pseudepigraphic character of very similar but non-canonical works. Dodd in *According to the Scriptures* is less certain than Professor Bruce implies that the Lord "formally set before" his disciples "a comprehensive scheme of biblical interpretation" (p. 110). Indeed the scriptures influenced the writers of the New Testament in many and very different ways, and it is very doubtful whether—for example—Stephen's defence in Acts 7 can be regarded as exemplifying the same treatment of scripture as St Paul's synagogue address in Acts 13. 16 ff. But these are small points in a very valuable essay.

Robert Leaney.

Nottingham University.

---

# SHORTER NOTICES

The Gospel according to St Matthew. By Floyd V. Filson. A. and C. Black. 1960. 28s.

The Theology of St Luke. By Hans Conzelmann. Faber. 1960. 30s.

The Path to Glory. By J. R. H. Moorman. S.P.C.K. 1960. 21s.

The first of these books, by the Dean of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, is a worthy addition to the extremely useful series of New Testament commentaries now being published by Black. Eminently readable, it is calculated to provide all but the specialist with the truly reliable results of recent Matthaean studies. The reader will not find in the Commentary so much brilliant speculation as sound exposition based upon sober scholarship and, be it added, upon knowledge of the real needs of the ordinary student. But amid the quiet and reverent exegesis there will arise many a sudden flash of insight and illumination, where the reader might expect that there was nothing new to say. In the Introduction the

author discounts the tendency to find "a clear and steadily advancing development of either a chronological, a geographical, or a theological outline" in the gospel (as, e.g., in B. W. Bacon's thesis of a Christian Pentateuch in Matthew). The evangelist's "teaching interest in topical grouping of material and the desire to present early and often the Church's witness to Jesus" prevented this, but if "this sacrifices literary neatness, the experience of the Church attests the practical value of the way the author adapted his material to the teacher's work in the Church". A particularly valuable section of the Introduction is the discussion of the various prominent themes, e.g. the Person of Jesus, Moses and the Law, and the Kingdom, which characterize this gospel.

Very different is Professor Conzelmann's study of St Luke, published in 1953 and now available in translation. This is an original piece of meticulous scholarship, which in neither thought nor language shows mercy to the reader. Contrary to C. H. Dodd's generally accepted conclusion that there exists a consistent pattern in the primitive Christian Kerygma, this author maintains that while Luke takes material from Mark he certainly does not take the pattern of the Marcan construction. "Thus the remarkable fact emerges that there is agreement between the pattern of the speeches in Acts and Mark, but not between the speeches and Luke's outline of the ministry of Jesus." He bases his thesis upon a brilliant and exhaustive survey of the alterations Luke makes in Mark's geographical framework of the Ministry, and of the peculiar features of Luke's eschatology and his modifications of Mark. He concludes that Luke saw "the story of salvation in three clearly defined stages, (*a*) the period of Israel, (*b*) the period of Jesus' ministry, and (*c*) the period since the Ascension, on earth the period of the *ecclesia pressa*, during which the virtue of patience is required and in which it is possible by virtue of looking back to the period of Jesus, also to look forward to the Parousia. For Luke the Parousia itself does not represent a stage within the course of saving history, but the end of it It corresponds to the other extreme, the Creation." The life of Jesus is thus seen not as pointing to an imminent End, but standing in its own right, within history as its Centre, and the Church's function is to prepare men in the light of the central fact for the Kingdom which is indeed coming but not necessarily soon. In other words Luke is no longer to be regarded simply or even primarily as a historian, but as a theologian of no mean order who faced the problem of the delay in the Parousia and systematically re-interpreted in the light of this the primitive record of the works and words of Jesus, and thus was able in the second volume of his work to give due weight for the first time to the place of the Church and the function of the Spirit in the Divine plan of salvation. The patient reader cannot fail to be impressed by the accumulated mass of delicate but never fanciful exegesis, with which the theme of the book is substantiated. The book is an important one and may well be a permanent contribution to our understanding of the gospel as it was received by the early Church.

The Bishop of Ripon's book covers the same ground but in a fundamentally different way. Disclaiming the intention of writing a Commentary and deliberately setting aside all problems of textual criticism, the writer aims at helping us "to see the life and teaching of Christ as it appeared to a contemporary, and to suggest some thoughts for our own guidance as we try to think out the message of the Gospel in our days". This has been done superbly. The writer indeed knows how to speak in the idiom of our generation. In presenting the tenderness, generosity and humanity of the Lukan gospel, which perhaps makes it to-day the most popular of the four, he nevertheless does not spare our foibles, our prejudices and our sins. His applications are always interesting, frequently arresting, sometimes scathing, occasionally awe-inspiring in the clarity of their penetration into the claims of Jesus upon men. This is not a book to be read through but to be prayed over. It would provide the clergy with much fresh and invigorating material for sermons and for everyone ideal reading in Lent and Passiontide.

G. E. P. Cox.

Liverpool.

---

A Guide to the Thought of St Augustine. By Eugène Portalié, S.J. Burns and Oates. 1960. 42s.

This is a translation of the article on St Augustine which filled 200 columns in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (1902). Gilson in the bibliography appended to his masterly *Introduction* (1928) marked it as "absolument indispensable"; and it is probably still the most comprehensive survey of Augustinian theology in existence. The translation is an American enterprise, and may perhaps be taken as a Catholic counterpart to the recently published *Companion to the Study of St Augustine* edited by R. W. Battenhouse. An introduction by Vernon J. Bourke attempts to survey the extensive literature which has appeared during the half-century since Portalié wrote, and a select bibliography has been added, in which nearly half of the works listed belong to this later period. Even so, there are some noticeable omissions, such as Nörregaard's *Augustins Bekehrung* and Nygren's *Eros und Agape*. The translation is readable though not free from mistakes, especially in the renderings of Portalié's Latin citations: there is a double blunder in an important passage from the *Contra Academicos* on p. 16.

Father Portalié's familiarity with the entire Augustinian corpus must have equalled if not surpassed that of his *bête noire* Jansenius; but his zeal for clearing "le saint docteur" from Protestant aspersions makes him too much the apologist to inspire confidence outside the Roman allegiance. He was too ready to see post-Tridentine orthodoxy in Augustine when it is certainly not there: e.g. we are told that the *De doctrina Christiana* "views the Bible as a great source of Christian doctrine, although not the only or the primary one" (p. 60)! Texts cited are not seldom made to support a theory upon which they have no bearing, or taken to establish teaching as Augustinian with-

out consideration of their date—as in the reference to the confident promises of "Reason" in the *Soliloquies* as showing that Augustine regarded the "proofs" of God's existence as demonstrative (p. 106). And it is distressing to find the full Augustinian doctrine of predestination, including the providential distribution of "sufficient" and "efficacious" graces, presented as "the dogma which all Catholics have recognized as the true Pauline tradition".

The published price seems too high to bring the volume within the reach of many for whom the original would be inaccessible. One is inclined to think that a translation of Portalié's companion article on *Augustinianism*, shorter but not less magisterial, would have performed a greater service.

J. Burnaby.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

---

The Imitation of God in Christ. By E. J. Tinsley. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 21s.

The "Imitation of Christ" suggests a type of devotion which, however honourably placed in the classical tradition, is not for everyone. The phrase itself too easily degenerates into a pious cliché, so for this concept to be treated anew in terms of solid scholarship is cause for rejoicing. For myself, the sub-title of this book—"An Essay on the Biblical Basis for Christian Spirituality"—is even more exciting, and any competent study in this field must be important to the biblical-pastoral synthesis which is now beginning to take shape. Mr Tinsley's *forte* is plainly biblical and, so far as I dare pass judgment here, he is assuredly competent. The book is less directly pastoral, yet its implications for the whole Church are of incalculable significance, the author is obviously aware and enthusiastic that this should be so. This book could give fresh impetus to the revival of Anglican ascetical theology, which I am convinced is its real subject whatever curious little games are played with the ambiguities of the word "mysticism".

Because the book is so important, and because we are promised another, I presume to offer some criticism in the hope that it may be of use: first, need such an exciting theme be treated in quite such a doggedly "donnish" style? This is truly pastoral theology which should be studied by a much wider group than "professional" scholars; in its present form I very much doubt if it will be; but I sincerely hope I am wrong. Secondly, there are far too many unnecessary quotations, some tediously long. Thirdly, these quotations, together with biblical and other references, are indiscriminately dotted about in both text and footnotes.

Finally, I think the "pastoral" chapters I and II are by far the weakest and they are not really necessary. Mr Tinsley has done enough by so brilliantly unearthing his main points which are too plain to be missed and too important to be cursorily treated.

I hope these four points are neither petty nor pedantic: it does

seem a pity that such pastoral pearls should be wrapped up in so ugly a parcel. I can only assure the reader that the pearls are there.

MARTIN THORNTON.

---

THE RACIAL PROBLEM IN CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE. By Kyle Haselden. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 15s.

A BISHOP ON SAFARI. By L. E. Stradling. S.P.C.K. 1960. 5s. 6d.

JOHN SHINES THROUGH AUGUSTINE. By A. P. Carleton. Lutterworth Press. 2s. 6d.

Much of the literature of race relations is ephemeral and should be waged as a pamphlet and periodical warfare. Not that there is an onward movement in thought but because after one has repeated the half-dozen basic principles which have been well stated a hundred times, one is dealing with deep prejudices and the dimly lit recesses of the human mind. Mr Haselden valiantly advances with a monograph. He is a minister of religion and a white southerner of unimpeachable ancestry, a veritable Pharisee of the Pharisees. His book is "an attempt to declare from a Christian point of view what the situation is and what Christian people ought to do about it" (p. 19). He argues both sides, analyses carefully and states his conclusions forcibly; if argument can convince the gentry Mr Haselden is dealing with, his book should have great effect. In trying to discover the part Christians should play, the author avoids the "what are the Churches doing" approach, which always lead to despair. Rather he asks what God is doing and how the people of God can enter into that work.

The author has limited himself to the modern situation in the United States. This gives his work intensity and focus, but it inevitably foreshortens the perspective and narrows the vision. It is nigh on five centuries since Africans began to sell their brethren to be shipped by white men who called themselves Christians; the alleviation brought by papal pronouncements and the evangelical success in ending the slave trade were nullified by white annexation of the black man's homeland. The problem is acute in three continents. The book would have been of much greater value had it glanced at the position of the white African in Kenya, or the Union, the Congo or Rhodesia, or at the plight of the West Indian settler in Britain or the Senegalese in France. In some places in Africa the white man hangs on to a shaky supremacy; in an increasing number of others the black man is becoming boss and will show his white brother where power lies. In the minds of some white men there is lurking a kind of thought-image in which light, life and enjoyment are being swallowed up by the powers of darkness and blackness. Some abandon and run, others who have nowhere to run will fight to the end and pull down the fabric of life in ruins as they do so. On the opposite side there is a myth of the noble savage *redivivus*, in the form of "the African personality", "négritude", or "pan-Africanism", gradually incarnating itself in a kind of messianic and prophetic

figure with his own *Herrscherkultus*. Mostly it is an innocuous sentimentalism in art, drumming, food and dancing, but it can call customs like female circumcision beautiful or fill newspapers with material calculated to stir up xenophobia and race hatred. In this situation the whims of some youths near Nottingham bus station or in a snack-bar in Milwaukee, of some Congolese soldiers when confronted with a Flemish woman whose husband is absent, can obliterate the effects of a lifetime of patient effort by men of goodwill on both sides. All the more reason for men like Mr Haselden to make their views known and to unite their efforts. "Agree with thine adversary whilst thou art in the way with him." Behind both black and white rascals stand world hunger and the millions of Asia. Probably only a miracle can save the situation, but that is not to say that the Lord of History is beyond miracles or that Christians are not his instruments in one.

*A Bishop on Safari* is one of S.P.C.K.'s Seraph paper-backs. It tells of the work of Bishop Stradling, who was in charge of Masasi and then went on to South-west Tanganyika, towards Lake Nyassa. We are given some intimate glimpses of the life of these central African dioceses, the crown of U.M.C.A.'s incredible achievement. The book is also an example of the welcome change that has come over missionary literature. Instead of giving an exotic picture calculated to elicit charity, if not pity, we are shown parishes and congregations much like our own, bravely tackling some of the problems which baffle us, blissfully unaware of some of the mole-hills we have made into mountains. The overseas Church may save us yet, that is if in our admiration and fellow-feeling we do not forget to emulate the amazing generosity in men and money of our Victorian ancestors.

With *John Shines through Augustine*, Bishop Stephen Neill's *World Christian Books* start a new venture. The idea is to make the works of some of the ancient Fathers accessible to readers in many parts of the world who can understand straightforward English or a translation into one of the great languages like Arabic, Urdu or Bengali. The Rev. A. P. Carleton, of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, here gives us excellently translated selections from St Augustine's Homilies on St John's Gospel. The antiquity of this classic should appeal to a Brahmin; the reminder that Augustine came from this continent may do something to break down the belief that Christianity is the European's tribal religion. Let us hope it will not be long before we hear from that "Asian", John Chrysostom. While admiring such efforts by the author and general editor, one must still bewail the ignorance about *World Christian Books* and the vital part they are playing in the strategy of the world Church, betrayed by so many of the leading churchmen one meets, be they European, American or African.

N. Q. King.

Legon, Ghana.

The Development of Physical Theory in the Middle Ages. By James A. Weisheipl, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 1960. 4s.

Margery Kempe. By Martin Thornton. S.P.C.K. 1960. 15s.

Biblical Authority for Modern Preaching. By Charles W. F. Smith. The Westminster Press (Philadelphia). 1960. $3.50.

The Liturgy Develops. By E. C. R. Lamburn. W. Knott and Son. 1960. 8s. 6d.

The exploration of the region where religion, philosophy and science meet has been pursued since the dawn of civilization, and continues along its three roads. Dr Weisheipl, in his small but not slight book, tells how the Medieval Church took up the quest from Plato and Aristotle, and, with the Bible and their Faith as guides, advanced to fresh positions. He leaves off at the point where Galileo and Isaac Newton appear, starting off on another journey of exploration along the road of natural science. Dr Weisheipl explains clearly the teaching on this subject of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas and of the later "Mertonians", and expresses the hope that the mathematical world-theories of modern physicists will be supplemented with a unifying physical theory of nature, as that suggested by Albertus Magnus. A useful introduction to a difficult, fascinating and important subject.

The little library of fourteenth-fifteenth century English spiritual works has received an interesting addition in the *Book* of Margery Kempe, discovered in 1934. Margery lived in King's Lynn, worshipped at St Margaret's, was active in parochial affairs; married and had fourteen children; took a vow of voluntary chastity; pilgrimaged to Jerusalem and Rome dressed as a maiden; prayed much; wept long and often; enjoyed with her confessor "full high and godly cheer" at an inn; four times was charged with taint of Lollardy and acquitted. She died while nursing her senile husband, but not before she, who confessed herself illiterate, had written her *Book* which the brethren of St Aelred's monastery found worth preserving. One would wish to know more of Margery. Fr Thornton in *Margery Kempe* examines her teaching and experiences, and concludes that they belong to the English tradition of sane, disciplined, ascetical prayer. Margery was an ordinary soul, not a mystic, who was remarkable for the "breadth, range, and constancy" of her prayer; "after nearly five and a half centuries, it (her *Book*) is remarkably relevant to some of the pastoral and ascetical problems which now confront us". After reading Fr Thornton one will want to read *The Book of Margery Kempe*.

*Biblical Authority for Modern Preaching* is concerned with the gulf between the worlds of the pulpit and of the pew. How to bridge it? The author writes of the situation in America; it is interesting to find him advocating an official lectionary and sermons based on the appointed lessons. He has much to say about translating the biblical message into modern terms, using the ugly words "demythologising" and "remythologising". The crux of the problem, apart from that of communication, is that the preacher is rarely a prophet. The

latter, who may never enter a pulpit, gets his message across by the power of his prophetic inspiration. The preacher must patiently learn the technique of teaching if his Sunday sermon is to hit any mark at all. Evangelists and Teachers follow Prophets in the Ephesian order of ministry, and need a more painstaking application of the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit. A book for the preacher, and perhaps for the pew to see what it looks like from aloft.

Moving from pulpit to altar there is no release from the pressure of changed circumstances. The Church, by force of its minority situation in the world, is relearning the significance of being the People of God, and worship is recovering old, half-forgotten, values. The Liturgical Movement is producing a spate of books, but this one, *The Liturgy Develops*, should not be overlooked. From the historical chapters which establish the principles the author moves on to discuss the liturgy of the future. He gives two examples of what that liturgy might be: (1) an ideal Anglican Liturgy, and (2) a compromise Liturgy making use of the materials of the 1662 Prayer Book. Both draw inspiration from ancient liturgies, and are alive to present needs.

KENNETH A. PEARSON.

EWHURST RECTORY,
ROBERTSBRIDGE.

---

INTRODUCTION TO RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY. By Geddes MacGregor. Macmillan. 1960. 30s.

ETHICAL STUDIES. By James Kellock. Christian Literature Society. 1959. Rs. 3.75.

"Religious Philosophy" might well, I imagine, be the name of two activities: that of presenting arguments for or against the existence of God, and that of drawing out the philosophical implications of an already formed belief in God. Both these activities are indulged in by Professor MacGregor in his book, and perhaps the main reason for the confusing impression which it makes is that there is no clear division between the one and the other. One is a little surprised, at the beginning of the book, to find a rather laboured argument about the place of religious commitment in the philosopher's equipment, and the end of the book follows this up with an autobiographical Epilogue setting out the author's personal convictions. Clearly he is sensitive on this point: he wishes to do "objective" philosophy, yet at the same time he does not feel he can keep his own position out of it. There is no reason why he should not have it both ways so long as he makes it clear what he is doing; but in fact many of his discussions of philosophical and religious opinions are little more than a critique from an overtly Christian point of view of such diverse topics as pantheism, atheism, naturalism, agnosticism, evolution, symbolism, and many more; and where one most expects an academic treatment, one is apt to find a crude *ad hominem* argument. The following quotation concludes a discussion of the teleological argument: "The presence of order and purpose that confronts us . . .

only points to the existence of such a Being; it does not prove this, in any ordinary sense of the word 'prove'. But perhaps the contemplation of the evidence of order and purpose does make the atheist look inexcusably smug."

Perhaps the best section in the book is that which deals with the "mystery of evil". After recognizing that the existence of evil is a problem *only* for the theist, Macgregor goes on to give an excellent discussion of various religious solutions. The rest of the book is necessarily cursory, considering the very large amount of ground it attempts to cover; but the author claims only "to provoke thought rather than to provide even the outline of a comprehensive philosophical system". It is a pity that on so many of the topics he allows himself to make up the reader's mind for him.

*Ethical Studies* is an "introduction" in a more academic sense, and is written mainly for Indian students. This is a thoroughly professional piece of work, and is all the more interesting for its treatment of contemporary Indian problems and its references to Hinduism. Nevertheless the book is depressing: the Christian ethic is represented as a set of prohibitions and ideals; salvation is through the teaching and example of Christ; and there is no more than a minimal place allotted to the Holy Spirit, who, at least for St Paul, is responsible for most of what is liberated, exciting and joyful in Christian conduct.

A. E. Harvey.

Chelsea.

---

*The Churches and the Church*, by B. Leeming, reviewed in March, is published in England by Darton, Longman and Todd.

# BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Abingdon Press (New York): Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Shape of Death* ($2.25).
Allen and Unwin: W. G. Maclagan, *The Theological Frontier of Ethics* (28s.).
A. and C. Black: Sherman E. Johnson, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (25s.).
Burns and Oates: David Knowles, *The English Mystical Tradition* (25s.).
Geoffrey Chapman: Dom Georges Lefebvre, O.S.B., *The Well-Springs of Prayer* (8s. 6d.).
Collins: Bertil Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (21s.).
Darton, Longman and Todd: Francis Clark, S.J., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (50s.).
Desclée de Brouwer (Bruges): H. M. Diepen, *La Théologie de l'Emmanuel: les lignes maîtresses d'une Christologie* (195 FB.); J.-M. Perrin, O.P., *Le Mystère de la Charité: textes et études théologiques* (210 FB.).
Epworth Press: A. Marcus Ward, *The Gospel according to St Matthew* (12s. 6d.).
Hodder and Stoughton: J. H. Churchill, *Prayer in Progress* (10s. 6d.); H. N. V. Temperley, *A Scientist who Believes in God* (15s.).
Lutterworth Press: A. G. Reynolds (Ed.), *Life and Death* (6s.).
Mowbrays: R. McL. Wilson, *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas* (21s.).
St Thomas Press (Houston, Texas): T. Robert Ingram, *The World under God's Law* [cyclostyled] (n.p.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

## According to Mark

PHILIP CARRINGTON

A running commentary on the oldest Gospel, and an interpretation of it within the setting of Christian worship in the Early Church. Particular attention is given to the part played by the oral tradition in the development of the text. 50*s. net*

## Victor and Victim

J. S. WHALE

This new volume, sub-titled 'The Christian Doctrine of Redemption' states and interprets the essentials of Christian theology for people to-day. Dr Whale writes on the problems of evil, death and destiny with his usual clarity and directness. 18*s.* 6*d. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

# INTERNATIONAL SUMMER COURSES

AT

# ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

**Central College of the Anglican Communion**

**July 3 - 15** LITURGY AND LIFE

**July 17 - 29** TOWARDS NEW DELHI: CHRIST THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD

**July 31 - Aug. 12** CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY AND THE FAITHS OF THE WORLD

Lecturers: Rev. Fr. Roland F. Palmer (Canada), Rev. Basil Minchin (London), Rev. E. Dargan Butt (U.S.A.), Rt. Rev. A. M. Hollis (formerly Bishop of Madras), Rev. David M. Paton (London), Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham (Durham), Rev. Fr. M. Jarrett-Kerr (Cardiff), Rev. Canon K. H. M. Creal (Canada), Rev. Canon A. K. Cragg (Warden of St. Augustine's College).

***Full details from:***

***The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent***

## *Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice?*

**MARKUS BARTH**

The common definition of Sacrifice as a gift to God, a means of expiation and an establishment of communion with God is not sufficient to exhaust what the New Testament says on Jesus Christ's death. A study of the Old Testament words and laws and stories to which New Testament writers allude or refer when they call Christ's death a sacrifice, reveals that this sacrifice is a gift of God to man, a self-disclosure of God and an act of liberation with juridical character and relevance. This sacrifice is not subject to the prophetic criticism of legalistic ceremonial, but it is indicative of the fulfilment of both the law and the prophets.

Markus Barth, son of Karl Barth, is Professor of New Testament, University of Chicago.

*Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper No. 9* **7s 6d net**

## *Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus*

**CHRISTIAN TINDALL**

The Codex Sinaiticus, now in the British Museum, is one of the oldest Biblical manuscripts in existence. Though its exact date remains a mystery evidence shows that the Sinaiticus was in existence by about the middle of the fourth century A.D.

The late Christian Tindall devoted the last ten years of his life to studying the Codex Sinaiticus. In this study he considers what light a statistical analysis of various passages can cast on the problem of assigning a date to the manuscript. The Rev. A. Q. Morton who has also made a study of the Codex and in addition has had a special training in statistics has contributed an appendix summarising the salient points of Mr. Tindall's argument.

The work is completed with seven plates of typical pages of the Codex Sinaiticus. **21s net**

**Oliver and Boyd**

*Tweeddale Court, 14 High Street, Edinburgh 1*